Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2006

REMARKS

By way of this Amendment, Applicant has amended elaim 1 to distinguish over the cited

references and put the present application in condition for allowance. Applicant has amended

elaim 12 to improve readability. Applicant has canceled claim 13.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 7-14 under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1, 2 and 7-14 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Solem

et al. (USPN 6,210,432). The Examiner asserts that Solem et al. provides a cover sheet that is

selectively retracted thereby exposing the body and allowing the hooks to extend into the

adjacent tissue. The Examiner asserts that, as broadly worded, Applicant's amendment fails to

distinguish over the method of Solem et al.

In response, Applicant has further amended claim 1 to recite the steps of transluminally

advancing the prosthesis into the coronary sinus such that a distal end portion of the prosthesis

is in contact with an inner wall of the coronary sinus and actuating a pull wire on the catheter to

actively advance at least one tissue anchor on the distal end portion from a retracted position to

an extended position.

Solem et al. does not disclose or suggest a method wherein a prosthesis is advanced such

that the distal end portion is in contact with the coronary sinus and a pull wire is actuated on the

catheter to actively advance at least one tissue anchor on the distal end portion from a retracted

position to an extended position. Accordingly, Solem et al. fails to anticipate Applicant's amended claim 1. Dependent claims 2 and 7-12 and 14 include additional features which

further distinguish Applicant's claimed invention over Solem et al.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the

Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Solem

et al.

Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2006

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15 and 17 under 35 USC §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15 and 17 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Cohn et al. (USPN 6,890,353). As noted above, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further clarify preferred features of the present invention.

Cohn et al. discloses a method wherein a delivery cannula (109) is retracted to expose distal and proximal anchors (139, 142) on the cinching device (106). Cohn et al. does not disclose a method of actively anchoring a prosthesis wherein the distal end portion of the prosthesis is in contact with the coronary sinus and a pull wire is actuated on the catheter to actively advance at least one tissue anchor on the distal end portion from a retracted position to an extended position. Accordingly, Cohn et al. fails to anticipate Applicant's amended claim 1. Dependent claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 15 and 17 include additional features which further distinguish Applicant's claimed invention over Solem et al.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Cohn et al.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Solem et al. in view of Rhee et al. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the cited references. Therefore, claim 4, which recites additional features, is also distinguishable over the cited references.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn et al. in view of Rhee et al. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the cited references. Therefore, claim 4, which recites additional features, is also distinguishable over the cited references.

Rejection of Claims 5 and 19 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 19 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Solem et al. in view of Griffith et al. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to

Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2006

distinguish over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 5 and 19, which recite additional features, are also distinguishable over the cited references.

Rejection of Claims 5 and 19 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 19 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn et al. in view of Griffith et al. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 5 and 19, which recite additional features, are also distinguishable over the cited references.

Rejection of Claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over. Solem et al. in view of Griffith et al., as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Kadhiresan. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the cited references. Therefore, claim 6, which recites additional features, is also distinguishable over the cited references.

Rejection of Claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn et al. in view of Griffith et al., as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Kadhiresan. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the cited references. Therefore, claim 6, which recites additional features, is also distinguishable over the cited references.

Fees Due to File This Amendment

Prior to the pending Office Action, a fee was paid for the original 54 claims, with 5 of them being independent claims. The aforementioned amendments have not resulted in more than the original number of claims, and thus no claim fees are believed to be due to file this amendment.

Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2006

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the above remarks, Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the attorney of record at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb. 27, 2007

David L. Hauser

Registration No. 42,643

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES LLC

One Edwards Way Irvine, California 92614

Telephone: (949) 250-6878 Facsimile: (949) 250-6850 Customer No.: 30452